## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed November 29, 2005, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks. The claims as presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

The abstract of the disclosure and claims 1, 4, 17, 25, 26, 28, 32, and 43 have been amended. Claims 3 and 34 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 32 have been amended to clarify that the header row is determined by determining whether the list range includes a field name for each column in the cell range and if the identified list range does not include any field names, then automatically generating a field name for each column in the cell range, wherein the automatically generated field names comprise the header row for the list range. Claim 4 has been amended to change the dependency from canceled claim 3 to amended claim 1. Claims 17 and 43 have been amended to clarify that a list data type comprises a single data type for an entire list. Claim 25 has been amended to clarify that the filter control is utilized for accessing a dropdown menu for an autofilter feature for selecting a sorting method for displayed data. Claim 26 has been amended to delete the reference to the filter control specified in a claim 25. Claim 28 has been amended to change the dependency from claim 26 to claim 25. Support for these amendments may be found in canceled claims 3 and 34, and on page 9, lines 24-27, page 13, lines 5-20, and page 18, lines 3-16 of the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-16 and 25-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bauchot (U.S. Pub. 2001/0007988). Claims 17-24 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Abdalla (U.S. 6,625,499).

## Specification

In the Office Action, the abstract of the disclosure is objected to for exceeding 150 words. The abstract has been amended to delete the excess words. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

### Claims 1-16 and 25-42

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 and 25-42 are rejected as being anticipated by Bauchot. Claims 3 and 34 have been canceled. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a method in a computer system for automatically creating a list in an electronic spreadsheet. The method includes receiving a user request for selecting a cell range in the electronic spreadsheet for displaying data, the cell range including one or more cells in one or more columns, identifying a list range for the selected cell range in the electronic spreadsheet, and determining a header row for the list range. The step of determining a header row for the list range includes determining whether the list range includes a field name for each column in the cell range and f the identified list range does not include any field names, then automatically generating a field name for each column in the cell range, wherein the automatically generated field names comprise the header row for the list range. The method further includes generating a border for surrounding the list range to create the list.

Bauchot discloses a method and system, in an electronic spreadsheet, for preserving "summary" information of a cell named range when spreadsheet elements (e.g., rows, columns, or pages) are added from the cell named range. Bauchot, however,

14

fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, Bauchot fails to disclose determining a header row for a list range of cells in a spreadsheet by determining whether the list range includes a field name for each column in a cell range and if the identified list range does not include any field names, then automatically generating a field name for each column in the cell range, wherein the automatically generated field names comprise the header row for the list range, as specified in amended independent claim 1. In the Office Action, it is alleged that Bauchot teaches automatically generating a field name for columns in a cell range in Figs. 3C (where a cell A4 does not include a field name) and 3D (where the cell A4 is populated with the name "United Kingdom"). However, as can be seen in Fig. 3D, the cell A4 populated with "United Kingdom" does not comprise a header row for the list range which is specified in the step of automatically generating field names in claim 1. Thus, since the cell containing "United Kingdom" is not in a header row, Bauchot clearly fails to disclose this feature. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 4-9 depend from amended independent claim 1 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Amended independent claim 32 is directed to similar novel features as claim 1 and thus is also allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 33 and 35-36 depend from amended independent claim 32 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claims 2, 4-9, 32, 33, and 35-36 should also be withdrawn.

Referring now to amended independent claim 10, this claim specifies a method for automatically expanding a list in an electronic spreadsheet. The method includes

determining that at least one previously blank newly edited cell is adjacent to the list and automatically expanding the list to include the at least one previously blank newly edited cell. In the Office Action, it is alleged that Bauchot teaches this feature in the Abstract and Fig. 2A. However, it is respectfully submitted that Bauchot fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 10. For example, Bauchot fails to disclose determining that at least one previously blank newly edited cell is adjacent to a list in an electronic spreadsheet. In particular, neither the Abstract nor Fig. 2A describes a previously blank newly edited cell (i.e., a cell which was previously blank but now contains content). Based on the foregoing, claim 10 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 11-16 depend from amended independent claim 10 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Amended independent claim 37 is directed to similar novel features as claim 10 and thus is also allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 38-42 depend from amended independent claim 37 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claims 11-16, 37, and 38-42 should also be withdrawn.

Referring now to amended independent claim 25, this claim specifies a display device having rendered thereon a spreadsheet including structured data. The structured data includes a list range for displaying data in one or more columns, a header row for identifying at least one column in the list range, a border for surrounding the list range, and a filter control for each column in the list range for accessing a dropdown menu for an autofilter feature for selecting a sorting method for the displayed data. It is respectfully submitted that Bauchot fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features

specified in amended independent claim 25. For example, Bauchot fails to disclose a filter control for each column in a list range in a spreadsheet utilized for accessing a dropdown menu for an autofilter feature for selecting a sorting method for displayed data. determining that at least one previously blank newly edited cell is adjacent to a list in an electronic spreadsheet, as specified in amended independent claim 25. In the Office Action, a filter row" is alleged to be disclosed in Fig. 2A and paragraph 40 of Bauchot, however no specific reference is made to a "filter row" in the aforementioned paragraph. Moreover, Fig. 2A fails to disclose either a "filter row" or a filter control for accessing a dropdown menu for an autofilter feature for selecting a sorting method for displayed data. Therefore, based on the foregoing, claim 25 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 26-31 depend from amended independent claim 25 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

<div align="center">

### Claims 17-24 and 43

</div>

In the Office Action, claims 17-24 and 43 are rejected as being anticipated by Bauchot. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 17 specifies a method for automatically validating data in a list in an electronic spreadsheet. The method includes determining a data type of data entered into the list, comparing the data type of the data entered into the list to a list data type, wherein the list data type comprises a single data type for the entire list, if the data type of the data entered into the list does not match the list data type, then determining that the data type of the data entered into the list is invalid, if the data type of the data entered into the list matches the list data type for the list, then determining the

<div align="center">

17

</div>

validity of the data entered into the list based on the data type, and if the data entered into the list is invalid based on the data type, then displaying an error indicator.

Abdalla discloses a tabular range editing mechanism for extending the functionality of a given table. A method is disclosed which facilitates the editing of a block of cells in a table even if the different columns are not of the same data type (See Col. 1, lines 43-50). Abdalla, however, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 17. For example, Abdalla fails to disclose comparing the data type of the data entered into a list to a list data type, wherein the list data type comprises a single data type for the entire list. On the contrary, Abdalla, at Col. 3, lines 15-28, discloses that each field (i.e.,) in a table may have numerous characteristics including data type and that data verification and validation may be associated with each field. Thus, Abdalla fails to disclose a single data type (and thus the validation thereof based on the data type) for an entire list of cells in a spreadsheet. Based on the foregoing, claim 17 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 18-24 depend from amended independent claim 17 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Amended independent claim 43 is directed to similar novel features as claim 17 and thus is also allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claims 18-24 and 43 should also be withdrawn.

## Conclusion

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicants assert that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the Office Action, and respectfully requests that the Examiner pass this application to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at 404.954.5035.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD

Date: April 5, 2006

Colin S. Wright
Reg. No. 57,202

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE